

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-  
TARY AFFAIRS AND WORKS AND  
HOUSING (SHRI BHISHMA  
NARAIN SINGH):** (a) Yes; Sir. The  
DDA had invited applications from  
the persons belonging to Low Income  
Group and Middle Income Group,  
twice in 1975—first in February and  
then in August. For the first scheme  
the amount of earnest money for LIG  
was Rs. 500/- and for MIG Rs. 1000/-,  
and for the second scheme, 50 per cent  
of the premium was demanded as  
earnest money.

(b) Yes, Sir. The unsuccessful ap-  
plicants were asked to take back the  
earnest money. The unsuccessful  
LIG applicants of the second scheme  
were individually requested in 1977 to  
re-deposit the earnest money of Rs.  
1000/- in case they had taken the re-  
fund of the earnest money, as a deci-  
sion had been taken to offer plots to  
them.

(c) Yes, Sir. But only those who  
are covered in the reply to part (b)  
above.

(d) Yes, Sir. No applicant remain-  
ed unsuccessful in MIG category in  
the second scheme.

(e) Does not arise.

#### **Enquiry Committee on Irregularities in U. G. C. Building Expenses**

**3742. SHRIMATI SANYOGITA  
RANE:** Will the Minister of EDUCA-  
TION AND SOCIAL WELFARE be  
pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the en-  
quiry committee on for the irregulari-  
ties of the UGC buildings' expenses had  
recommended further detailed probe  
into the matter;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the reaction of the Government  
thereto?

**THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION  
AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI S. B.  
CHAVAN):** (a) to (c). The findings  
of the One-man Enquiry Committee on  
the alleged irregularities in the build-

ing projects financed by the University  
Grants Commission, were entrusted to  
the C. B. I. for further investigations.  
The C. B. I. registered some cases in  
July 1979 and the investigation is in  
progress.

#### **IDLE Staff at Kandla Port**

**3743. SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE:**  
Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE  
be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that nearly  
216 workers engaged in operating vacu-  
uator machines at Kandla Port are  
lying idle for the last 4 years;

(b) if so, the reasons thereof; and

(c) the reasons why these idle staff  
are not being utilised at marine un-  
loader now being operated by the  
Port?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN  
THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE  
AND RURAL RECONSTRUCTION  
(SHRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN):** (a)  
to (c). The Food Corporation of India  
have reported that nearly 300 skilled,  
semi-skilled and unskilled workers  
were recruited by the Kandla  
Port Trust in connection with grain  
unloading operations that commenced  
in Kandla as far back as 1965-66. Over  
the period of time the work load has  
been varying depending on the tempo  
of grain traffic at this port. During  
the last nearly 3 years the quantum of  
traffic has come down considerably.  
Export of grain to USSR was proposed  
to be handled utilising machines (Op-  
erating in the reversed direction)  
but this was resisted by the port and  
dock labour. In the meantime, the  
workers were deployed on the routine  
maintenance, mechanical clearing  
operations of exportable grain at  
Gandhidham and other maintenance  
activities connected with storage and  
maintenance. The Marine unloader  
installation set up by the Department  
of Agriculture has been entrusted to  
the Kandla Port Trust for operation  
and maintenance. The staff on vacu-  
uator operation was originally recrui-  
ted by the Kandla Port Trust and

transferred to the Department of Food and by the latter to the Food Corporation of India in 1973. Under separate agreement with the Ministry of Agriculture, the Kandla Port Trust has already recruited staff for operation and maintenance of the marine unloader installation. Kandla Port Trust authorities have also been requested to utilize some of the staff available with the Food Corporation of India but they have not agreed. The Food Corporation of India are framing voluntary Retirement Scheme with incentives in respect of the staff which cannot be fully utilised.

#### Allocation on Education

3744. SHRI SATYASADHAN  
CHAKRABORTY:

SHRI PHOOL CHAND  
VERMA:

Will will the Minister of EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) the reasons for not implementing Kher Commission's recommenda-

tions for 10 per cent allocation in the Central Budget on education; and

(b) the percentage of allocation on education during the last three years in States Budget, State-wise and year-wise?

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): (a) Kher Committee had made this recommendation over 30 years ago. In the National Policy Resolution 1968, it has been stated "The aim should be gradually to increase the investment in education so as to reach of level of expenditure of 6 per cent of the national income at early as possible". The current level of expenditure on education as per centage of national income is 3.7. It has not been possible to reach the target set in the National Policy Resolution due to resource constraints.

(b) A statement, giving the available information about the percentage of allocation on education during the last three years in the State Budgets, is enclosed.

#### Statement

A—State	1978-79 (Budget Estimates)		1979-80 (Budget Estimates)		1980-81 (Budget Estimates)	
	Percentage of allocation on Education by Education Departments to Total State Budget	Percentage of allocation on Education by All Departments to Total State Budget	Percentage of allocation on Education by Education Departments to Total State Budget	Percentage of allocation on Education by All Departments to Total State Budget	Percentage of allocation on Education by Education Departments to Total State Budget	Percentage of allocation on Education by All Departments to Total State Budget
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Andhra Pradesh . . . . .	20.8	25.2	20.1	25.4	19.6	25.2
2. Assam . . . . .	23.1	25.7	25.4	27.9	25.5	27.8
3. Bihar . . . . .	27.3	31.2	27.8	31.3	26.2	29.4
4. Gujarat . . . . .	23.0	27.6	21.4	25.2	18.8	23.2
5. Haryana . . . . .	16.6	21.0	16.5	20.9	15.7	19.9
6. Himachal Pradesh . . . . .	20.9	23.7	19.6	22.6	23.0	25.5